

REMARKS

Applicants acknowledge receipt of the Examiner's Office Action dated January 10, 2008. Claims 4-8, 12-16, and 24-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rappoport, U.S. Patent No. 6,828,963 (Rappoport). After careful consideration of the remarks made in the present Office Action, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 4-8, 12-16, and 24-27, as now amended, are not rendered unpatentable by the combination of the sections of Rappoport cited in the present Office Action and common knowledge in view of the arguments herein.

Regarding independent Claim 24, nothing in the cited passages of Rappoport discloses (or renders obvious) "in response to the converting the product management information into a target form, performing an update of an existing product management record in the target computerized product management system using the product management information in the target form, wherein the existing product management record resided in the target computerized product management system prior to converting the product management information." Page 4 of the present Office Action asserts that at least col. 5, lines 36-46 of Rappoport discloses the recited features of independent Claim 24.

Col. 5, lines 36-46 of Rappoport discloses:

An underlying objective in the data exchange techniques described herein is that the design intent from the source CAD model should be preserved. What this means in practice is that the resultant CAD data structure for the target computer system preserves the ability of a subsequent engineer to manipulate, on a feature by feature basis, the target CAD data structure – just as if the engineer were operating on the source CAD data structure. Of course, this level of manipulation will not always be possible, and indeed it is not even a necessary requirement of the invention, but it is preferred nonetheless. (*emphasis added*)

Also, page 7 of the present Office Action states:

The cited portion of Rappoport indeed discloses updating an existing record (in this case, a CAD structure) while it is in the target form. Applicant's argument is directed to the fact that the updated structure has not necessarily gone through the extraction and conversion scheme. However, such is not required by the recited claims. The claim only requires that the updated record is an *existing* record.

PATENT


Applicants have amended independent Claims 24, 26, and 28 to include the elements of “in response to the converting the product management information into a target form, performing an update of an existing product management record in the target computerized product management system using the product management information in the target form, wherein the existing product management record resided in the target computerized product management system prior to converting the product management information.” Support for the amendments can be found in at least pages 7 and 8 of the present Office Action. Applicants' amendments to independent Claims 24, 26, and 28 recite a temporal relationship between the conversion of the product information and the update of the existing product management record, which resided in the target computerized product management system prior to the conversion. The cited passages of Rappoport disclose the update of a CAD drawing that has necessarily gone through the extraction and conversion operations and further modified on the target system. Therefore, since the existing product management record resided in the target computerized product management system prior to the conversions and did not go through the extraction and conversion operations, the combination of Rappoport and common knowledge does not disclose or render obvious each and every element of independent Claims 24, 26, and 28. Claims 24, 26, and 28 and all dependent claims are not rendered unpatentable by the combination of Rappoport and common knowledge. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that all claims are now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicant hereby petitions for such extensions. Applicant also hereby authorizes that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to deposit account 502306.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'E. Stephenson', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Eric A. Stephenson
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 38,321
Telephone: (512) 439-5093
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099